DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 269 016 IR 051 493

AUTHOR Stetson, Keith R.
TITLE Book Reviews in the Core Journals of Library and Information Science: A Bibliometric Comparative Analysis.
PUB DATE [85]
NOTE 38p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bibliometrics; *Book Reviews; Comparative Analysis; Indexes; *Information Science; Library Collections; Library Material Selection; *Library Science; *Periodicals; Position Papers

ABSTRACT

The core journals of library and information science were identified by overlap of coverage in Library Literature and Information Science Abstracts. Those core journals which review English language monographs in the field and are published by U.S. trade or university presses were identified. Reviews for the 6-month period from July 1, 1984, to December 31, 1984, were examined. Relationships between reviews, publishers of books reviewed, and the review journals are described. Despite the number of reviews of current imprints in American Libraries and Library Journal, the highest yield journals, their percentage of the total reviews published in the core journals would not allow a selector to rely on them alone. Only 32.7% of all 1983 and 1984 titles reviewed were listed in Book Publishing Record. It is suggested that selectors use reviews, announcement services, and publishers' announcements to identify new materials. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED269016

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OERI
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official position or policy.

BOOK REVIEWS IN THE CORE JOURNALS OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE: A BIBLIOMETRIC COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

by

Keith R. Stetson

IR051493

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Keith R. Stetson
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
1.	INTRODUCTION	1
2.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	2
	The Core Journals of Library and Information Science	2
	Book Reviews in the Journals of Library and Information Science	8
3.	DESIGN OF THE STUDY	15
	Purpose and Significance	15
	The Core Journals of Library and Information Science	15
	Identification of Reviews	16
	Data Extracted from the Reviews	19
4.	ANALYSIS OF RESULTS	22
	Reviews in the Core Journals	22
	Review Duplication	25
	Review Uniqueness	25
	Publishers of Titles Reviewed	29
	Book Publishing Record (BPR)	29
5.	CONCLUSIONS	33
	NOTES	34

TABLES

		Page
2-1	Library Literature Subject Headings Used in Literature Search.	4
3-1	The Core Journals of Library and Information Science. . . .	17
3-2	The Core Journals Containing Reviews with Abbreviation and ID# Used in Text.	20
4-1	Number of Reviews per Journal	23
4-2	Rank Order of Journals by Number and Reviews.	24
4-3	Review Duplication by Title Reviewed.	26
4-4	Review Duplication by Journal	28
4-5	Multiple Review Distribution.	25
4-6	Unique Titles Reviewed by Journal	30
4-7	Publishers of Reviewed Titles Ranked by Number of Titles Reviewed.	31

1. INTRODUCTION

Timely selection of monographs appropriate for addition to the collection of any library is an activity of great importance. Identification of current titles needed to support the teaching and research activities of a library school is of particular importance. No previous research has been found in the literature which compares the effectiveness of reviews in the core journals as a selection tool.

Almagro[1] notes that "book reviews influence library selection more than any other factor." The recent proliferation of information science titles that must be acquired for a library school library's collection makes librarians even more dependent on reviews. Reliance on publishers' catalogs and announcements, and suggestions by faculty and students of titles for purchase can be both inadequate and time consuming. Smaller print runs in all areas of publishing makes timely identification of new monographs a critical activity. Typically inadequate budgets often make the existence of a review of a title the deciding factor for purchase.

The core journals were first identified by those contained in two of the primary indexing and abstracting services of the field of library and information science: Library Literature and Information Science Abstracts, N=55. Each issue of these journals dated between July 1, 1984 and December 31, 1984 was examined for the presence of reviews of English language monographs in the field of library and information science. Of the total of the core journals as defined in

this study, 26 were found to contain reviews that fit the above qualifications. A bibliometric comparative analysis of the titles reviewed was performed. The efficiency of relying on this selection technique was analyzed for comprehensiveness and timeliness.

2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Two separate areas of research in the literature are related to the present research: a) the core journals of library and information science and b) book reviews in the journals of library and information science. As noted, no previous research has been found that combines a comparative analysis of these two areas. Accordingly, this literature review is divided into two parts. All issues of Library Literature published between January, 1980 and February, 1985 were searched, using the subject headings shown in Table 2-1. It is surprising how little past research has addressed these very important issues.

2.1 The Core Journals of Library and Information Science

Bottle[2] notes in a review article that one unusual feature of the literature of library and information science is the difficulty in delineating the boundaries of the subject. This aspect of the literature, as related to monographs, points out the gaps in collection development that would occur with reliance on announcements of new titles published by those firms, such as Libraries Unlimited, which are known to publish library and information science titles almost exclusively.

Clark and Clark,[3] discussing the core journals of anthropology, note a core can be identified through the methods of (1) basic lists, (2) user studies and (3) citation analyses. Their paper addressed the utility of these various methodologies in developing a core

TABLE 2-1: LIBRARY LITERATURE SUBJECT HEADINGS USED IN LITERATURE SEARCH

Acquisitions
Book Reviews and Reviewing
Book Selection
College and Research Libraries
  - Acquisitions
  - Book Collections
  - Book Selection
  - Serial Publications
Information Science Literature
Information Services-Special Subjects-Library Science
Libraries
  - Book Collections
Library Science Libraries and Collections
Library Science Literature
  - Evaluation
Periodicals, Information Science
Periodicals, Library Science
Publishers and Libraries
Serial Publications
Surveys
  - Book Reviews and Reviewing
  - Serial Publications

collection. The basic list method utilizes the subjective expertise of an individual, or group of individuals, tempered by the input of the compiler. User studies look at the "information gathering habits" of researchers in a field. Lists of the most frequently read or consulted journals reveal that few titles receive multiple readership by any one faculty. Variations within a field were found to parallel subject specialization of particular faculties. The use of non-English language materials is directly related to a discipline's literature. Citation analysis in anthropology has been confined to determining discipline structure, rather than journal usage. With the exception of two titles, all items noted in user studies were found in the citation studies. A considerable variation was found to exist between the basic list and citation analysis lists. Clark and Clark conclude that a combination of all three methods should be used to negate the limitations of each method.

Hirst[4] describes a core-list construction technique utilizing Journal Citation Reports. A "discipline impact factor" (DIF) is calculated by measuring the number of times a paper in a journal is cited in the core literature of a particular discipline. An approximation of a core list can be determined by using the formula DIF = nc/ns, where nc is the number of citations by journal J in journal C, and ns is the number of citable items published by journal J over a time period, which is fairly arbitrary. A threshold DIF is set for use to exclude journals of subsequent iterations from the citing set. This

threshold is discipline dependent, and could be adjusted to an individual library's needs. Core journals read for current awareness, but not often cited, or those which are new and for which citation data are not yet published will not be identified in this technique.

Bibliometrics, "the application of mathematical methods to books and other media of communication," is addressed by Narin and Moll.[5] "Bradford's Law," the basic law of bibliometrics, observes that there is a high degree of concentration of related papers in a relatively small number of journals. The basic concept of counting references as a means of identifying the core journals in a field was originated over 50 years ago. The files of the Science Citation Index and Social Science Citation Index have been widely used to study the literature of disciplines. Citation analysis has often been used to investigate the relationships between journals, for the purpose of journal selection. Bibliometric measures have been seen to correlate highly with the more subjective user and survey based measures. References in one journal have been used to develop core journal lists, as well as the importance of peripheral journals measured by their references in core journals. Expansion in the scope of citation indexing and standardization of information in computerized data bases are seen to increase the use of bibliometrics. Bibliometric techniques can claim a reliability seldom achieved by survey techniques. Bibliometrics continues to be used for the more economical and efficient management of materials.

Peritz'[6] paper is a bibliometric survey of research papers published in the core journals of librarianship. Her study was limited to journals "published in North America and Great Britain or by international bodies." The selection of core journals studied was based on the following bibliographic tools

Social Science Citation Index

Information Science Abstracts

Library and Information Science Abstracts

Referativnyi Zhurual: Informatika

Library Literature

Current Awareness-Library Literature

A total of 39 journals was selected, using these rules: a) all journals covered by SSCI and four of the tools were included. For journals which do not deal with information science this was reduced to SSCI and three tools; b) journals which are covered by four of the library science tools and not by SSCI were included if they were not state or regional society journals, news bulletins and similar publications, or journals devoted to some specialized field outside librarianship. For historical journals this criterion was relaxed to three tools; c) two journals which appeared in 1975, and hence could not be adequately covered by the above tools, were also included; d) weeklies, annuals, and abstracting journals were excluded. The present study identified 23 of Peritz' 39 titles, 12 of which contain book reviews.

Nour's[7] paper identified 41 core library journals. She described quantitatively 343 research articles in terms of subject, research method, and number of references. The 708 references to journal articles of a stratified random sample of 100 articles were examined. Subjects and research methods of the cited articles were described, and relationships between the source articles and the articles they cited were investigated. Patterns of research publication and references for each of the 41 core journals were discussed. Nour surveyed the library journals of 1980, and identified 41 core journals by applying rules concerned with their overlap in coverage in several bibliographical services. She compared the lists of journals indexed by

Library Literature

Library and Information Science Abstracts

Source Publications of the SSCI

Journals covered by at least two of these three services comprise her core list. State and local journals, weeklies, annuals and foreign language journals were excluded. Thirty-two of the 41 journals identified overlapped with the Peritz list. The present study identified 29 of these 41 journals, 19 of which publish reviews of library and information science monographs.

2.2 Book Reviews in the Journals of Library and Information Science

Almagro[8] believes that identification of medical journals containing book reviews of high quality is of great importance for

collection development in the field because of "epidemics of duplication and fad occurring in the area of medical books." She notes that ever larger portions of library budgets must be devoted to new serial titles, and price increases for existing subscriptions, making the acquisition of monographs a more exacting process. Using journal printouts available from the vendors used at the University of Arizona Health Sciences Center Library, (Faxon, EBSCO and Harrassowitz), 302 journals were selected subjectively by library staff to be examined on receipt for book reviews.

The state of the reviewing of current English language monographs in the field of library science as reflected in American and Canadian professional journals was addressed by Chen and Galvin.[9] They believe the selection process relies heavily on the adequacy of book reviewing in the professional journals. Alerting, selection, and peer appraisal are seen to be the basic functions of the professional review media. New books in the field are often not advertised heavily, making, in many cases, the review of a title the only method of identification. Chen and Galvin sought to address these questions:

1. what portion of current library science monographs can be identified through the primary announcement media (BPR, FB and/or PW "Weekly Record")
2. to what extent are these monographs being reviewed in a select group of professional library periodicals
3. which of the review media are the most comprehensive in coverage
4. which review media are the most timely
5. which titles are reviewed extensively

6. how detailed is the reviewing
7. to what extent are new monographs evaluated, rather than merely described
8. how frequent are negative reviews
9. what observations can be made about the identities and affiliations of reviewers

An attempt was made to compile an exhaustive list of English language monographs in library and information science with 1971 imprint dates through a search of classes 020-029 in the 1971-72 cumulation of BPR, supplemented by the PW "Weekly Record" and FB for 1971. Additional titles were located in the review media themselves. A list of 29 professional periodicals thought to review a significant number of library science books on a regular basis was prepared. All issues of these periodicals appearing between January 1971 and June 1973 were examined. They found, of a total of 222 monographs identified, 55 titles evaluated in the professional press that were not listed in any of the three Bowker listings. Approximately 25% of all 1971 monographic literature of librarianship could only be identified by scanning reviews. They also found that 26% of all new titles identified in the Bowker publications had not been reviewed during the survey period. They discovered that no single review medium covered even half of the new monographs identified, and that only two sources, Library Journal and Canadian Library Journal, evaluated a third of the monographs. A Bradfordian pattern of coverage by the reviews was found. Of the 222 monographs published in 1971, 95 were reviewed in more than one

journal. The extent of duplication among the five highest yield media was extensive. Of the total of all 1971 imprints reviewed, reviews of 82.9% could be found in one or more of the five highest yield journals. 57.2% of the titles identified as published in 1971, however, were either not reviewed or reviewed in only one journal. Although 42.8% of the monographs known to be published in 1971 were reviewed in more than one of the journals that contained any reviews, a substantial portion of newly published professional literature is ignored. Their results suggest a need for the professional journals to broaden their review coverage of new books in the field.

Fisher[10] makes the point that journals are the main source of book reviews in the field, and that, with shrinking budgets, librarians become ever more dependent on them. She believes that "scant attention has been paid to book reviews in library journals." Her study aimed to describe and compare the coverage, duplication patterns, biases of subject, language and source of publication, length, whether they are favorable, and the review section format of these 5 journals

Australian Library Journal

Australian Academic and Research Libraries

Library Association Record

Journal of Librarianship

Library Quarterly

The study also attempts an evaluation of the content of some of the reviews. Reviews are seen to be indispensable in collection building,

with timeliness of great importance. Duplication of reviews among the five journals in the period 1977 to 1979 showed that 2% of titles were reviewed three times, and 17% were reviewed twice. Fisher found that only 18% of the books reviewed were reviewed in the year of publication. Her qualitative evaluation of the reviews is not of interest in the present study.

MacLeod believes that "librarians rely heavily upon Library Journal and Choice when choosing books for purchase." Her study focuses on the methods by which books are chosen for review, the manner in which reviewers are selected, and the content of the reviews themselves. It is noted that 99% of the books reviewed by Library Journal are trade publications, which are the focus of the present study.

It has been seen that many librarians rely heavily on reviews when selecting books. Serebnick[12] analyzed the publishers of books reviewed in these six key library journals

Booklist

Choice

Kirkus Reviews

Library Journal

New York Times Book Review

Publishers Weekly

Specifically, her study attempts to determine if the journals review books of a wide diversity of publishers or if a small core of publishers accounts for a majority of the books reviewed. For the purpose of her

study, Serebnick defines small publishers as those who issue 20 or fewer books annually, and those who appear in an appropriate edition of

Small Press Record of Books in Print

Alternatives in Print

International Directory of Little Magazines and Small Presses

Book Publishers Directory

Publishers issuing more than 100 books annually are assumed to be large presses. Serebnick notes that few studies in the literature offer quantitative data on the publishers of the books that are reviewed in specific journals, a shortcoming that the present literature search found to be valid. The literature does include a number of "opinion papers" that strongly suggest that the review medium pays most attention to the publications of the larger publishers. Serebnick randomly selected 60 reviews from each of the journals, the data selected for the period 1972-1974. A second, more current sample of 60 reviews from each of the six journals was selected for books published 1978-1980. Book Review Index was used to locate all reviews of books reviewed in more than one of the journals. An analysis of the 1972-1974 data revealed that the 360 books were published by 146 different publishers, and that 5% (8) of the publishers accounted for 27% (96) of all the titles reviewed. Serebnick notes that the 1972-1974 data are Bradfordian in character, with a small group of publishers (15%) responsible for 51% of the books reviewed and 58% of the reviews in the six journals. On the other hand, 88 publishers (60%) account for less than one-fourth of the

books reviewed and for less than one-fifth of the reviews. The 1978-1980 data reveal obvious similarities. The data do reveal, however, that slightly more publishers issued the books, which received slightly fewer reviews in the six journals. The data show that a small core, in 1972-1974 eight larger trade houses and in 1978-1980 six large trade houses and one university press, issued one-fourth of the books reviewed, with some journals devoting as high as 38% of their reviews to the books of these publishers. Books issued by this small core of publishers also received more multiple reviews, with the books of the top eight publishers averaging four reviews each. Serebnick concludes that number of reviews is a stronger predictor of library purchase than is the existence of a favorable review, and that libraries dependent on reviews in the six journals for selection will be less likely to select books issued by the smaller, non-core publishers.

3. DESIGN OF THE STUDY

3.1 Purpose and Significance

The Library School Library at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill currently has active subscriptions to 1406 periodicals. The Librarian is responsible for selecting new monographs for purchase. Faculty and students are encouraged to recommend titles for purchase, but it is the Librarian's job to ensure that all new monographs in the field of library and information science are selected.

It can be seen that the routine scanning of 1406 periodicals for selection would be prohibitively time consuming. If a small, core list of journals could be identified as containing reviews of a high percentage of new monographs in the field, the efficiency of the selection process could be greatly improved. Also, if a small group of publishers could be identified as publishing a high percentage of titles in the field, the scanning of their catalogs and announcements would be a valuable secondary selection technique. It has been noted that a specialized library that supports the research and teaching of a particular discipline has the particularly vital function of acquiring and making available new monographs in the field in an expeditious manner.

3.2 The Core Journals of Library and Information Science

To characterize the journal literature of the field of library and information science and to establish a sample set from which to analyze

book reviews of English language monographs recently published in the discipline, the 55 core journals shown in Table 3-1 were identified. Basic lists or use studies and citation analysis have been widely used as methods to identify core journal lists in various disciplines. Clark and Clark found considerable variation between core lists identified by these two techniques.

Peritz and Nour identified basic lists by applying rules concerning overlap of indexing or abstracting of journals in various bibliographic utilities in the field. This study identified 55 core journals by virtue of their coverage in both Library Literature and Information Science Abstracts. The "Periodicals Indexed" list from the February 1985 issue of Library Literature and the "Journals Abstracted in Volume 18" list from v. 18 n. 6 (1983) Information Science Abstracts were used.

3.3 Identification of Reviews

Each issue of the 55 core journals published during the period July 1, 1984 and December 31, 1984 was examined for the presence of reviews of English language monographs on subjects in the field of library and information science. Only the publications of U.S. trade and university presses were noted. Titles produced by local, state or national organizations or agencies were not recorded. Proceedings and conference papers or reports were not included. Only titles on subjects in the field of library and information science were recorded; those journals which reviewed trade titles both in the field and in other subject areas were examined to enumerate only library and information titles,

TABLE 3-1: THE CORE JOURNALS OF LIBARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

American Archivist
American Libraries
ASLIB (Association of Special Libraries & Information Bureaus) Proceedings
ASIS (American Society for Information Science) Bulletin
Canadian Journal of Information Science
Canadian Library Journal
Catholic Library World
Collection Management
College & Research Libraries
Computer Equipment Review
Database
Documentaliste
Documentation et Bibliotheques
Drexel Library Quarterly
Government Publications Review
IATUL (International Association of Technological University Libraries) Proceedings
Indexer
Information Processing and Management
Information Technology & Libraries
INSPEL (International Journal of Special Libraries)
International Classification
International Forum on Information & Documentation
International Library Review
Journal of Academic Librarianship
Journal of Documentation
Journal of Education for Librarianship
Journal of Information Science
Journal of Librarianship
L.A.S.I.E. (Library Automated Systems Information Exchange)
Law Library Journal
Library Acquisitions Practice & Theory
Library Journal
Library Quarterly
Library Resources & Technical Services
Library Technology Reports
Library Trends
Microform Review
Nachrichten für Dokumentation: Zeitschrift für Information und Dokumentation
North Carolina Libraries
On-Line Review
Online: the Magazine of Online Information Systems

TABLE 3-1: THE CORE JOURNALS OF LIBARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE (cont'd.)

Program: Automated Library and Information Systems
Public Library Quarterly
Publishers Weekly
Quarterly Bulletin of the International Association of Agricultural Librarians & Documentalists
Reference Services Review
RQ
School Library Journal
School Library Media Quarterly
Science and Technology Libraries
Special Libraries
Tidskrift für Dokumentation
Top of the News
UNESCO Journal of Information Science, Librarianship and Archives Administration*
Wilson Library Bulletin

*Publication ceased with v. 5(4) 1983.

excluding others. In most cases in which multi-disciplinary reviewing existed, a specific section was found in which library and information science titles were isolated. These sections included the "Professional Reading Section" in Library Journal, "Professional Materials" in RQ, "Our Profession" in Wilson Library Bulletin, "The Source" in American Libraries, and "Professional Reading" in School Library Journal.

Among the 55 core journals shown in Table 3-1, 26 of the journals were found to contain reviews that fit the criteria previously described. Table 3-2 lists these 26 journals, with title abbreviations and title identification numbers used in sections following. The following data were recorded from each appropriate review: a) title reviewed, b) publisher, c) imprint date, d) LC card number or ISBN if imprint date not in review, e) journal abbreviation, volume and issue number. All issues of the 26 journals containing reviews as defined were available for examination.

3.4 Data Extracted from the Reviews

The 26 journals included were found to contain 259 reviews. The data extracted from each review were recorded on 3x5 index cards. The initial sort, which existed after the data collection, was alphabetical, by journal title. The reviews within each journal title were then alphabetized by title of book reviewed, and by imprint date of title reviewed. The number of reviews per journal, total and by imprint date, was then recorded.

TABLE 3-2: THE CORE JOURNALS CONTAINING REVIEWS, WITH ABBREVIATION AND ID# USED IN TEXT

Abbreviation	Title	ID#
AA	American Archivist	1
AL	American Libraries	2
CLJ	Canadian Library Journal	3
CRL	College & Research Libraries	4
GPR	Government Publications Review	5
IND	Indexer	6
IPM	Information Processing and Management	7
ITL	Information Technology & Libraries	8
IC	International Classification	9
JAL	Journal of Academic Librarianship	10
JD	Journal of Documentation	11
JL	Journal of Librarianship	12
LAPT	Library Acquisitons Practice & Theory	26
LJ	Library Journal	13
LQ	Library Quarterly	14
MR	Microform Review	15
OR	On-Line Review	16
ONL	Online	17
PRO	Program	18
PLQ	Public Library Quarterly	19
RQ	RQ	20
SLJ	School Library Journal	21
SLMQ	School Library Media Quarterly	22
SL	Special Libraries	23
TOP	Top of the News	24
WLB	Wilson Library Bulletin	25

The second sort was alphabetical, by publisher of title reviewed. The number of titles reviewed was recorded by imprint date. A third sort was alphabetical, by title, of all of the 259 reviews. Duplication of titles reviewed and uniqueness of title reviewing were noted.

As an addition to the analysis as defined thus far, the titles reviewed were compared with the 020-029 section of the 1984 issue of BPR (which includes 1983 imprints). Those titles in BPR and reviewed were noted.

4. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

4.1 Reviews in the Core Journals

Of the 259 monographic titles found to be reviewed in the 26 core journals, 52 were found to have been reviewed two or more times. When review duplication is taken into account, it is found that the 259 reviews addressed a total of 183 titles.

Table 4-1 shows the reviews, by journal and year of publication of the reviewed title. Three of the journals, IND, IC and OR reviewed only one title each during the sample period July 1, 1984 to December 31, 1984. Five of the 26 reviewed no 1984 imprints. These would be of little use for selection of current titles. The 7 1981 titles, 17 1982 and 84 1983 titles reviewed should have been already selected by reviews or other means in the past, and could be seen as probably useful for retrospective collection development only. It would undoubtedly be found that those journals with a high percentage of reviews of 1984 imprints would have reviewed these earlier imprints in past issues.

Table 4-2 shows that just one journal identified 42.8% of 1981 imprints and 52.9% of 1982 imprints. This high yield of reviewing books published in these years can hardly be seen as a positive trait. The three highest yield reviewers of 1983 imprints identified 42.9%, and the three highest yield reviewers of 1984 imprints contained 58.9% of the reviews. The percentage of reviews per journal falls off rapidly in the 1983 and 1984 imprints, showing that 21 of the core journals would need to be scanned to locate all 1983 reviews, and all 26 to locate the 1984

TABLE 4-1: NUMBER OF REVIEWS PER JOURNAL

ID#	Journal	N = 7 1981 #	%	N = 17 1982 #	%	N = 84 1983 #	%	N = 151 1984 #	%	N = 259 All Years #	%
1	AA					4	4.8	1	0.7	5	1.9
2	AL					1	1.2	48	31.8	49	18.9
3	CLJ					13	15.5	6	4.0	19	7.3
4	CRL	3	42.8	2	11.8	5	5.9	3	2.0	13	5.0
5	PGR					1	1.2	3	2.0	4	1.5
6	IND					1	1.2			1	0.4
7	IMP	2	28.6	9	52.9	2	2.4			13	5.0
8	ITL					3	3.6	3	2.0	6	2.3
9	IC	1	14.3							1	0.4
10	JAL					4	4.8	7	4.6	11	4.2
11	JO			2	11.8	6	7.1	2	1.3	10	3.9
12	JL					2	2.4			2	0.8
26	LAPT			1	5.9	3	3.6	2	1.3	6	2.3
13	LJ					1	1.2	26	17.2	27	10.4
14	LQ			2	11.8	14	16.7	2	1.3	18	6.9
15	MR	1	14.3					2	1.3	3	1.2
16	OR							1	0.7	1	0.4
17	ONL							6	4.0	6	2.3
18	PRO					4	4.8	2	1.3	6	2.3
19	PLQ					9	10.7	2	1.3	11	4.2
20	RQ					2	2.4	13	8.6	15	5.8
21	SLJ					3	3.6	5	3.3	8	3.1
22	SLMQ			1	5.9	2	2.4			3	1.2
23	SL					1	1.2	1	0.7	2	0.8
24	TOP					3	3.6	1	0.7	4	1.5
25	WLB							15	9.9	15	5.8

TABLE 4-2: RANK ORDER OF JOURNALS BY NUMBER OF REVIEWS

	1981		1982		1983		1984		All Years	
Ranking	Journal	%	Journal	%	Journal	%	Journal	%	Journal	%
1	4	42.8	7	52.9	14	16.7	2	31.8	2	18.9
2	7	28.6	4	11.8	3	15.5	13	17.2	13	10.4
3	9	14.3	11	11.8	19	10.7	25	9.9	3	7.3
4	15	14.3	14	11.8	11	7.1	20	8.6	14	6.9
5			26	5.9	4	5.9	10	4.6	20	5.8
6			22	5.9	1	4.8	3	4.0	25	5.8
7					10	4.8	17	4.0	4	5.0
8					18	4.8	21	3.3	7	5.0
9					8	3.6	4	2.0	10	4.2
10					26	3.6	5	2.0	19	4.2
11					21	3.6	8	2.0	11	3.9
12					24	3.6	11	1.3	21	3.1
13					7	2.4	26	1.3	8	2.3
14					12	2.4	14	1.3	26	2.3
15					20	2.4	15	1.3	17	2.3
16					22	2.4	18	1.3	18	2.3
17					2	1.2	19	1.3	1	1.9
18					5	1.2	1	0.7	5	1.5
19					6	1.2	16	0.7	24	1.5
20					13	1.2	23	0.7	15	1.2
21					23	1.2	24	0.7	22	1.2
22									12	0.8
23									23	0.8
24									6	0.4
25									9	0.4
26									16	0.4

reviews. This would still be preferable to scanning all 1406 periodicals received in the library school library mentioned.

4.2 Review Duplication

Tables 4-3 and 4-4 show duplication of reviewed titles by reviewed title and by journal reviewed in, respectively. Of the 183 titles identified in the 229 reviews, the 52 titles which received more than one review were reviewed as follows:

TABLE 4-5: MULTIPLE REVIEW DISTRIBUTION

Number Reviews	Titles	Total Reviews N = 128
2	36	72
3	11	33
4	4	16
5		
6		
7	1	7
	52	128

It can be seen that 28.4% of all titles reviewed received more than one review, and that all duplication of reviews was of 1983 and 1984 imprints only. Nearly 19% of all 1984 imprints, in particular, received multiple reviews, a fact which bodes well for selection of current imprints.

4.3 Review Uniqueness

Interestingly enough, AL, which published the greatest number of reviews of both 1983 and 1984 imprints, also published the largest number of reviews of 1984 imprints that were reviewed by no other

TABLE 4-3: REVIEW DUPLICATION BY TITLE REVIEWED

Reviewed Title	Journals Reviewed In 1981	1982	1983	1984
A				2,13
B			11,14	
C				2,13,29
D				1,10
E			1,14	
F			3,11,8	
G				13,21,25
H			10,13	
I				2,13,25
J			3,4	
K			6,24	
L				4,3,8,10, 14,19,18
M				20,25
N			4,26	
O				2,13
P				2,13
Q				13,20
R			3,10	
S			8,19	
T			7,18	
U				8,12,10,17
V				2,13
W			3,8,18	
X				2,13,20
Y				2,13
Z				2,20
AA				13,25
BB				2,21,24
CC				2,3,13
DD				2,25
EE				2,20
FF				2,13
GG			3,26	
HH				2,20,25
II				3,17
JJ			3,19,20	
KK				13,20
LL				2,25
MM				2,13
NN				2,8,17,20

TABLE 4-3: REVIEW DUPLICATION BY TITLE REVIEWED (cont.)

Reviewed Title	Journals Reviewed In 1981	1982	1983	1984
OO				5,15,20,25
PP			22,24	
QQ				2,20
RR				3,20
SS			3,22	
TT				3,10,19
UU				2,25
VV			3,4,14,19	
WW				2,5
XX			3,11	
YY				2,13
ZZ				2,25

TABLE 4-4: REVIEW DUPLICATION BY JOURNAL

Journal	Reviewed Titles Duplicated				
	1981	1982	1983	1984	Total N = 128
1			1	1	2
2				23	23
3			9	4	13
4			3	1	4
5				3	3
6			1		1
7			1		1
8			3	3	6
9					0
10			2	4	6
11			3		3
12					0
13			1	18	19
14			3	1	4
15				1	1
16					0
17				3	0
18			2	1	3
19			3	2	5
20			1	11	12
21				2	2
22			2		2
23					0
24			2	1	3
25				10	10
26			2		2
					128

journal, 19.8% of the total number of unique titles, Table 4-6. LQ and IPM published the next greatest number of unique reviews, only one of which, however, was of a 1984 imprint. LJ, which published the second greatest number of reviews of all imprint years, behind AL, published the second greatest number of unique reviews of 1984 imprints. It can be seen that the distribution of unique reviews points more toward an excessive time lag in reviewing, with the exception of AL and LJ, than it does to an ability to locate books for review that no other journal is able to identify.

4.4 Publishers of Titles Reviewed

Table 4-7 shows that Libraries Unlimited publishes far more reviewed titles than any other publisher, with 41.6% more titles reviewed than its nearest rivals, Bowker, Greenwood, and Scarecrow, respectively. When the total titles reviewed is considered, however, these four publishers produced together only 28.4% of the titles reviewed. The majority of the rest of the publishers are known for publishing titles outside of the library and information science area. This reveals the hit or miss, time-consuming nature of relying on publishers' catalogs and announcements for selection.

4.5 Book Publishing Record (BPR)

An examination of the 020-029 areas of all 1984 issues of BPR, which also includes all 1983 imprints, found only 32.7% of all 1983 and 1984 titles reviewed in the core journals were listed. This study

TABLE 4-6: UNIQUE TITLES REVIEWED BY JOURNAL

Journal	Unique Titles Reviewed				
	1981	1982	1983	1984	Total N = 131
1			3		3
2			1	25	26
3			4	2	6
4	3	2	2	2	9
5			1		1
6					0
7	2	9	1		12
8					0
9	1				1
10			2	3	5
11		2	3	2	7
12			2		2
13				8	8
14		2	11	1	14
15	1			1	2
16				1	1
17				3	3
18			2	1	3
19			6		6
20			1	2	3
21			3	3	6
22		1			1
23			1	1	2
24			1		1
25				5	5
26		1	1	2	4
					131

TABLE 4-7: PUBLISHERS OF REVIEWED TITLES RANKED BY TITLES REVIEWED

Rank	Publisher	1981	1982	1983	1984	Total N = 183
1	Libraries Unlimited			10	14	24
2	Bowker		1	10	3	14
	Greenwood		1	5	8	14
	Scarecrow		2	2	12	14
3	Oryx		1	3	9	13
4	Haworth		1	4	6	11
	Knowledge Industries	1	1	4	5	11
5	Shoe String			1	9	10
6	Neal-Schuman		1	1	6	8
7	Ablex		2		4	6
8	Information Resources		1	3	1	5
9	Maracel Dekker	1	1	1	1	4
10	Meckler			1	2	3
	North-Holland	2			1	3
	Wiley			2	1	3
11	Academic		1		1	2
	Gale	1		1		2
	Jossey-Bass	1			1	2
	Lexington			1	1	2
	McGraw-Hill		1	1		2
	Prentice-Hall		2			2
	James Rush Assoc.			1	1	2
	H.W. Wilson	1		1		2
12	ABC-Clio				1	1
	Archon				1	1
	Bantam				1	1
	Baker Book House				1	1
	Brodart				1	1
	G. Burke			1		1
	Elsevier			1		1
	Forest Pr.			1		1
	Hayden				1	1
	ISI Pr.				1	1
	JAI Pr.			1		1
	Learned Information				1	1
	McFarland			1		1
	Pergamon		1			1
	Pierian				1	1
	Reston				1	1
	Univ. California Pr.			1		1
	Univ. Chicago Pr.				1	1
	Univ. N.C. Pr.			1		1
	Univ. Washington Pr.			1		1
	Van Nostrand-Reinhold				1	1
	Westview				1	1
						183

concerned itself only with English language monographs issued by U.S. trade and university press. The high percentage of omissions in BPR cannot be explained by the foreign or ephemeral nature of books reviewed.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Despite the high yield of reviews of current imprints, particularly 1984, in AL and LJ, their percentage of the total number of reviews identified in the 26 core journals would not allow a selector to rely on them alone. Sixteen of the 26 core journals, in fact, contained one or more reviews of 1984 imprints that were reviewed in no other journal.

The number of reviews of 1981 and 1982 imprints particularly, and those of 1983 imprints to a lesser extent, point to a need for the editors of most of the core journals to modify their reviewing policies and procedures, resulting in more timely reviewing. Further research on timeliness of reviewing is needed.

The results of searching BPR for appropriate English language monographs in the 020-029 subject areas reveals that this method of selection alone would not be even remotely comprehensive.

It is possible that a journal or journals not identified in the core group by the methods of this study may provide more timely and/or comprehensive review coverage of monographs appropriate for a collection that serves the teaching and research needs of a school of library and information science. It appears, however, that a selector would have to rely on journal reviews, publishers announcements, BPR and other Bowker guides, and suggestions by faculty and students, and still not expect to identify all appropriate materials. Further research on the timely selection of English language monographs in the field of library and information science is appropriate.

NOTES

[1]Bertha R. Almagro, "Book Reviewing in Medical Journals," Serials Librarian 9 (Winter 1984): 121-31.

[2]R. T. Bottle, "Literature of Librarianship and Information Science: a review article," Journal of Librarianship 17 (January 1985): 49-53.

[3]Barton M. Clark and Sharon E. Clark, "Core Journals in Anthropology: a review of methodologies," Behaviorial and Social Sciences Librarian 2 (Winter 1981/Spring 1982): 95-110.

[4]Graeme Hirst, "Discipline Impact Factors: a method for determining core journal lists," ASIS Journal 29 (July 1978): 171-2.

[5]Francis Narin and Joy K. Moll, "Bibliometrics," Annual Review of Information Science and Technology 12 (1977): 35-58.

[6]Bluma C. Peritz, "The Methods of Library Science Research: some results from a bibliometric survey," Library Research 2 (1980-81): 251-268.

[7]Martyvonne Morton Nour, "Research in Librarianship: an analysis of research articles in core library journals of 1980," (unpublished Masters Paper, School of Library Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1983).

[8]Peritz, op. cit.

[9]Ching-Chih Chen and Thomas J. Galvin, "Reviewing the Literature of Librarianship: a state of the art report," American Reference Book Annual 6 (1975): xxxi-xlv.

[10]Susan Fisher, "Book Reviews in Five Library Journals: a comprehensive analysis," Australian Library Journal 30 (August 1981): 87-96.

[11]Beth MacLeod, "Library Journal and Choice: a review of reviewers," Journal of Academic Librarianship 7(1) March 1981: 23-28.

[12]Judith Serebnick, "An Analysis of Publishers of Books Reviewed in Key Library Journals," Library and Information Science Research 6(1984): 289-303.